WATERSHED PROJECTS

(Brundage Watershed, Idaho; Calapooya Creek Watershed, Oregon; Elk Creek Watershed, Kansas; Los Olmos Creek Watershed, Texas; South Fork Licking River Watershed, Ohio)

(98-37)

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

MARCH 15, 1984

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

33-558 O WASHINGTON : 1984

H641-8

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey, *Chairman*

GLENN M. ANDERSON, California
ROBERT A. ROE, New Jersey
JOHN B. BREAUX, Louisiana
NORMAN Y. MINETA, California
ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS, Georgia
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota
HENRY J. NOWAK, New York
ROBERT W. EDGAR, Pennsylvania
ROBERT A. YOUNG, Missouri
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia
DOUGLAS APPLEGATE, Ohio
GERALDINE A. FERRARO, New York
BRIAN J. DONNELLY, Massachusetts
DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA, Michigan
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
GUS SAVAGE, Illinois
FOFO I. F. SUNIA, American Samoa
KATIE HALL, Indiana
DOUGLAS H. BOSCO, California
JAMES F. McNULTY, Arizona
JIM MOODY, Wisconsin
ROBERT A. BORSKI, Pennsylvania
JOE KOLTER, Pennsylvania
TIM VALENTINE, North Carolina
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI, Illinois
MICHAEL A. ANDREWS, Texas
TOM J. VANDERGRIFF, Texas
J. ROY ROWLAND, Georgia
JAMES McCLURE CLARKE, North Carolina
ROBERT E. WISE, JR., West Virginia
GENE SNYDER, Kentucky
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
BUD SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
ARLAN STANGELAND, Minnesota
NEWT GINGRICH, Georgia
WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR., Pennsylvania
GUY MOLINARI, New York
E. CLAY SHAW, JR., Florida
BOB McEWEN, Ohio
FRANK WOLF, Virginia
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
HAL DAUB Nebraska
LYNN MARTIN, Illinois
VIN WEBER, Minnesota
ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH, Oregon
DON SUNDQUIST, Tennessee
NANCY L. JOHNSON, Connecticut
RON PACKARD, California

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES

ROBERT A. ROE, New Jersey, *Chairman*

JOHN B. BREAUX, Louisiana
DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA, Michigan
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
J. ROY ROWLAND, Georgia
GLENN M. ANDERSON, California
JAMES L. OBERSTAR, Minnesota
HENRY J. NOWAK, New York
ROBERT W. EDGAR, Pennsylvania
ROBERT A. YOUNG, Missouri
NICK JOE RAHALL II, West Virginia
GERALDINE A. FERRARO, New York
BRIAN J. DONNELLY, Massachusetts
GUS SAVAGE, Illinois
FOFO I. F. SUNIA, American Samoa
JAMES F. McNULTY, JR., Arizona
JIM MOODY, Wisconsin
JOE KOLTER, Pennsylvania
JAMES J. HOWARD, New Jersey
(Ex Officio)
ARLAN STANGELAND, Minnesota
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, Arkansas
WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR., Pennsylvania
GUY MOLINARI, New York
BOB McEWEN, Ohio
HAL DAUB, Nebraska
VIN WEBER, Minnesota
ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH, Oregon
RON PACKARD, California
GENE SNYDER, Kentucky
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

ALL PROJECTS

Testimony of: Page

Haas, Joseph W., Deputy Chief for Natural Resources Projects, Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, accompanied by Edward Riekert, Assistant Director, Basin and Planning Division, Soil Conservation, U.S. Department of Agriculture 19

Prepared statement 2

Response to supplemental questions posed by Representative Stangeland 22

BRUNDAGE WATERSHED, IDAHO

Testimony of:

Craig, Hon. Larry E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Idaho 24

Prepared statement 24

Submission for the record:

Symms, Hon. Steven D., U.S. Senator from the State of Idaho, statement 26

CALAPOOYA CREEK WATERSHED, OREGON

Submission for the record:

Weaver, Hon. James, a Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon, statement 33

ELK CREEK WATERSHED, KANSAS

Testimony of:

Slattery, Hon. Jim, a Representative in Congress from the State of Kansas 31

Submission for the record:

Kassebaum, Hon. Nancy, U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas, statement 32

LOS OLMOS CREEK WATERSHED, TEXAS

Submission for the record:

de la Garza, Hon. E (Kika), a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas, statement 33

SOUTH FORK LICKING RIVER WATERSHED, OHIO

Testimony of:

Kasich, Hon. John, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio, accompanied by Wilma Stokely 26

Miller, Hon. Clarence E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio 29

Submission for the record:

Miller, Hon. Clarence E., statement of the South Fork Licking Watershed Conservancy District 29

WATERSHED PROJECTS

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1984

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER RESOURCES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in room 2167, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Robert A. Roe (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. ROE. Good morning. Today the Committee on Water Resources meets to receive testimony on five proposed watershed projects of the Soil Conservation Service. These projects are the Brundage Watershed in Idaho; Los Olmos Creek Watershed in Texas; South Fork, Licking River Watershed in Ohio; Calapooya Creek Watershed in Oregon; and the Elk Creek Watershed in Kansas.

Public Law 566 of the 83d Congress as amended authorizes the Soil Conservation Service to give technical and financial help to local organizations in planning and carrying out watershed projects for flood prevention, agricultural water management, recreation, and water supply. If a proposed project contains a structure providing more than 4,000 acre-feet of storage, it is referred to our committee and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. Authorization requires a resolution of both committees. The smaller projects are referred to the House and Senate Agricultural Committee, where they can also be authorized by committee resolutions. The five projects on which we will receive testimony this morning require resolutions adopted by our committee and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Our first witness today is the Honorable Joseph Haas of the Soil Conservation Service. Therefore, I yield to Mr. Haas, as I would now recognize my distinguished colleague and my good friend, the Honorable Arlan Stangeland from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Today we have the opportunity to receive testimony on five valuable small watershed projects. The five projects before us today have been submitted by the Soil Conservation Service for authorization.

As you state, they would be located in Ohio, Texas, Kansas, Idaho, and Oregon. The Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee approved these projects last year, and I'm hopeful that the information gathered today will lead to approval by our committee as well.

I look forward to receiving what I'm sure will be worthwhile testimony and wish to extend a warm welcome to all of our witnesses today.

Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Mr. ROE. I thank the gentleman.

We now recognize our distinguished first witness, Mr. Joseph Haas, Deputy Chief of Natural Resource Projects, Soil Conservation Service, accompanied by Mr. Riekert.

Mr. Stangeland?

Mr. STANGELAND. Joe, I also want to welcome you back. If you'll go ahead with your testimony, we'd appreciate it.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Haas, the full text of your prepared statement will appear in the record at this point.

[Statement referred to follows:]

STATEMENT BY JOSEPH W. HAAS, DEPUTY CHIEF FOR NATURAL RESOURCE PROJECTS, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before your committee to support the five watershed projects under consideration; Brundage Watershed, Idaho; Elk Creek, Kansas; Calapooya Creek, Oregon; South Fork Licking River, Ohio; and Los Olmos, Texas. These proposed projects have been prepared in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, Public Law 83-566. I have with me Mr. Edward Riekert, Assistant Director for our Basin and Area Planning Division, who will assist me and provide a brief technical explanation of each project.

As with all watershed projects of the Soil Conservation Service, these five projects were initiated by local units of government and other sponsoring organizations. The project applications for assistance were passed through the offices of the governors to assure consistency with State plans and programs.

Watershed projects are developed by teams that cooperate with local conservation districts, county governments, and other local entities. Local steering committees are generally formed to give guidance to the planners and help establish planning objectives, establish priorities, and help select the final plan. Many times sponsors provide actual resources—in services or dollars—to aid the planning effort itself.

The Administration has been reassessing the Federal role in water development and the procedures by which projects are formulated. It is our position that National Economic Development (NED) is the appropriate objective to guide the formulation of water resources projects in which the Federal Government participates. Generally, we will recommend the plan that produces the greatest net economic benefits unless other factors warrant an exception. In fact, exceptions have been granted by the Secretary of Agriculture for four of the projects for your consideration today. The NED plan was selected for implementation by the sponsors in the Los Olmos Watershed Plan. The Brundage Watershed and Calapooya Creek plans provide for reduced Federal outlays compared to the NED plans. The Elk Creek and South Fork Licking River plans include a small additional increment of Federal cost to provide additional benefits to the environment.

It is also our policy that direct beneficiaries should bear a substantial burden of the costs of services they receive from water projects, and that services should be provided by the public or private organizations that can provide them at the lowest real cost. Federal water project planners should, of course, give full consideration to local, State, and international concerns as they help develop projects; but features which benefit nonfederal interests should be paid for by those interests.

The watershed program administered by the Soil Conservation Service is compatible with these concepts. Watershed projects are not direct Federal undertakings. They are initiated by local sponsoring organizations. In addition, State and local entities participate financially in a substantial manner. The amount of participation varies by purpose. For flood prevention, local sponsors provide all landrights and will operate and maintain the completed facilities. The Federal Government pays the construction cost in accordance with Public Law 83-566. At least 50 percent of any costs allocated to recreation are paid by project sponsors, including landrights. For drainage and irrigation, sponsors must provide at least 50 percent of the construction cost and provide all landrights required.

During the next few years we will be giving highest priority to planning projects that emphasize erosion control, flood prevention, and water conservation. We will continue to encourage multiple-purpose projects to make optimum use of construction sites, but expect the primary purpose to be those mentioned.

For a detailed explanation of the five projects being considered, I will now defer to Mr. Riekert.

BRUNDAGE WATERSHED, IDAHO

The Brundage Watershed contains 45,077 acres and is located in the northeast corner of Adams County in south central Idaho. All creeks and streams in the watershed are tributaries of the Little Salmon River, a tributary of the Salmon River. The watershed is typical of the region, having mountains that reach 7,600 feet in elevation interspaced with valleys and meadows at 3,800 to 4,000 feet. The upper watershed is timbered and the spring runoff is diverted for irrigation from the numerous creeks and streams.

There are approximately 605 people living in the watershed, with approximately 174 of these people residing in the communities of Meadows and New Meadows. The economy is based on agriculture, with livestock and timber being the principal enterprises. Meadow Valley is the feed base for livestock between the winter range and the feedlot.

There are 55 ranches in the watershed that range in size from less than 50 acres to over 1,500 acres. They are all family-owned enterprises with an average size of about 270 acres.

Goose Creek drainage, the watershed's major stream, contains three developed bodies of water. Brundage Reservoir, with approximately 2,900 acre-feet of water; Goose Lake with 5,700 acre-feet of water; and Twin Lakes with 600 acre-feet of water. These reservoirs are owned and operated by ranchers in Meadows Valley to store spring runoff for irrigation later in the summer. All three reservoirs are in the Payette National Forest.

There are now 11,105 acres of pastureland in the valley, of which 10,096 acres are irrigated. In the watershed there are 4,396 acres of well-drained soils and 5,700 acres of high water table soils.

Year-round recreation resources are abundant in the watershed. There is fishing and hunting in addition to winter sports, campgrounds, picnicking, and sightseeing. The Little Salmon River, Goose Creek, and the reservoirs are used for fishing, boating, picnicking, and camping.

The major watershed problem is shortage of late summer and fall season forage for beef cattle. This is caused by an inadequate water supply to meet the July, August, and September irrigation needs and by the low level of management the present physical facilities allow the irrigators to practice. The U.S. Forest Service has determined that the existing Brundage Reservoir Dam is unsafe and must be either breached or rebuilt to modern specifications. If the dam is breached, the water shortage will occur even earlier in the irrigation season and the reliability of sufficient water will be reduced. Other problems include a lack of good timber production management on privately owned woodlands that are grazed by yearling cattle, and tributary streams of the Little Salmon River that exceed the State's fecal coliform standard.

The Brundage Watershed Project has been planned to provide full season irrigation water supply, improve overall irrigation efficiencies, and improve quality of Brundage Reservoir fishery and wildlife habitat. This plan proposes the enlargement of the Brundage Reservoir to a storage capacity of 7,330 acre-feet, the improvement and extension of existing canals (including necessary structural components such as diversions and headgates) and the application of land treatment measures.

Structural measures include construction of a new dam at the site of the existing Brundage Reservoir. The dam will be approximately 53 feet high with a storage capacity of 7,330 acre-feet. The earth fill of the existing dam will be removed to bedrock and the existing concrete core will become part of the new dam.

The Forest Service plans four practices on Federal lands directly associated with Brundage Reservoir. They include seeding of approximately 20 acres of wetland vegetation tolerant to drawdown conditions, 6 wildlife islands constructed and vegetated to enhance wildlife habitat, construction of a public sanitary facility, and 3-1/2 miles of access road improvements between Brundage Reservoir and Goose Lake Campground.

Works of improvement on the irrigation distribution systems will consist of repair and/or replacement of deteriorating structures which presently have an estimated life of less than about 25 years. Approximately 112 new turnout structures will be required plus an additional 30,800 feet of new ditch.

The land treatment program consists of ongoing and accelerated technical and financial assistance to watershed landowners and/or operators. The program calls for technical assistance for the application of planned conservation practices which would not be installed with the present program, and financial assistance for the treatment of approximately 10,096 acres of irrigated pastureland.

The management of 820 acres of private woodland improvement would include removal of dead and diseased trees as well as harvest of mature trees. The land treatment practices planned include pasture planting of improved grass species on disturbed areas to maintain soil protection and the cross fencing of fields to facilitate the planned grazing systems. Land smoothing and leveling, water control structures, contour ditches, and border irrigation will result in improved irrigation efficiency.

The estimated average annual benefits occurring to the structural measures are $320,040. These benefits include reduced operation and maintenance and increased agriculture production. The land treatment program will increase the operator's management capabilities on their ranches, conserve their irrigation water resources, manage the forage with proper conservation for maximum production, and improve the economic base of the area. The average annual costs are estimated to be $243,100.

With enlargement of the Brundage Reservoir there will be 7,330 acre-feet of water available for fishing at the maximum pool. There will be a conservation pool of 500 acre-feet that will provide adequate water to overwinter fish in the reservoir. The increased late season flows in Goose Creek will improve the habitat for rainbow trout, whitefish, and cutthroat trout.

33-558 O—84——2

BRUNDAGE WATERSHED, IDAHO

Size and Location -

45,077 acres in Adams, County

Sponsors -

Brundage Water Users Association, Inc.
Adams Soil Conservation District
Goose Creek Canal Company
South End Ditch Company

Purposes - Irrigation, Fish and Wildlife

Principal Measures - Soil conservation practices on farms and structural measures consisting of enlargement of the Brundage Reservoir and the improvement of the distribtuion system.

Annual Benefits and Costs	Average Annual Dollars Benefit (7 3/8 - 50 years)	Cost
Irrigation	320,040	243,100

Capital Costs	P.L. 566 Funds Dollars	Pct.	Other Funds Dollars	Pct.	Total Dollars
Land Treatment Measures	0	0	87,500	100	87,500
Structural Measures					
Irrigation	1,623,700	57	1,115,500	43	2,739,200
TOTAL	1,623,700	57	1,203,000	43	2,826,700

September 17, 1982

ELK CREEK WATERSHED, KANSAS

Elk Creek Watershed covers 89,036 acres and is a subwatershed of the Delaware River in Atchison, Jackson, and Nemaha Counties of northeastern Kansas. The watershed is approximately 25 miles long with an average width of 6 miles. The watershed contains 58,465 acres of prime farmland.

The only unincorporated cities in the watershed are Circleville, with a population of 178, and Holton with a population of 3,242. The watershed's rural population is 1,380. The Topeka metropolitan area lies 35 miles south of the watershed, Atchison is 24 miles east and the Kansas City metropolitan area begins about 50 miles to the southeast.

There are 495 farms in the watershed that average about 172 acres each. Principal crops are corn, grain sorghum, wheat, alfalfa and soybeans. Beef production is the major livestock enterprise. All operating units are diversified.

Major problems in the watershed are flooding, erosion, and grade instability. Approximately 8,825 acres are subject to flooding including 6,618 acres of cropland. Flood damage averages $994,900 annually including $282,400 gully damages and $413,400 crop and pasture damage.

Elk Creek Watershed is in one of the more highly erodible areas of the state. Soil erosion is a limiting factor in maximizing agriculture production. The greatest loss of soil is through sheet erosion on cropland. The average sheet erosion on upland cropland is calculated at 12.9 tons per acre per year with a range from 42.0 to 1.7 tons per acre. Areas affected by gullies (16,500 acres) are, or will be, used at less than their best agriculture productive uses. Scour has reduced productivity by 26 to 38 percent on 1,144 flood plain acres. Other problems in the watershed include a shortage of water based public recreation areas and a shortage of water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural use.

The project has been planned for watershed protection, flood prevention, grade stabilization, water supply, and public recreation. Ten years will be required for project installation.

Planned project measures include accelerated and associated land treatment on 8,000 acres of cropland, 5,800 acres of grassland and 2,700 acres of forestland. Farmers cooperating with conservation districts will apply the land treatment.

Seventy grade stabilization structures will be installed to stabilize grades and reduce flooding. Each grade stabilization dam will have a drop inlet type principal spillway constructed to maintain water at a specific elevation to control a gully problem and to store floodwater in a detention pool. Associated land treatment, including terraces and grass waterways, will be installed where necessary in the drainage area of the grade stabilization dams.

A multi-purpose earth fill dam will be constructed to provide 3,872 acre feet for floodwater retardation, 750 acre feet for agriculture water supply; 1,500 acre feet for municipal and industrial water supply and 5,310 acre feet for recreation. Public recreation facilities will be provided for fishing, boating, picnicking, swimming, and other uses.

The installed project will reduce soil losses in the watershed by 16 percent. Floodwater and sediment damages will be reduced on 8,825 acres of flood plain within the project and 6,005 acres of Delaware River flood plain below the project. Prime farmland will increase by 1,518 acres.

Grade stabilization structures and the multipurpose reservoir will increase landscape diversity, improve fishery resources and provide additional feeding and resting sites for waterfowl. There will be 1,721 acres of water including a 520 acre reservoir for public water based recreation and wildlife management. Rural area development will be advanced through increased farm incomes and employment opportunities, decreased flood related expenses, and a more stable economy.

The major impact on water quality in Elk Creek will be reduction of sediment load. Pools created by dams will benefit impoundment oriented aquatic wildlife and decreased sediment concentrations downstream will benefit stream oriented aquatic wildlife.

Total annual benefits for the structural measures and associated land treatment are estimated to be $1,816,000. Of this total, $1,194,000 will be for flood prevention, $428,000 for recreation, and $194,000 for agricultural, municipal, and industrial water supply. The estimated average annual cost is $1,070,100.

ELK CREEK WATERSHED, KANSAS

Size and Location - 89,036 acres in Atchison, Jackson, and Nemaha, Kansas

Sponsors -

Delaware Watershed Joint District No. 10
Atchison County Conservation District
Jackson County Conservation District
Nemaha County Conservation District
City of Holton, Kansas, Jackson County
Jackson County Rural Water District No. 3

Purposes -

Watershed protection, flood prevention, recreation, agricultural, municipal, and industrial water supply.

Principal Measures - Grade stabilization structures, multipurpose dam and recreation facilities.

Annual Benefits and Costs	Average Annual Dollars Benefit (7 7/8)	Cost - 5[illegible] years)
Flood Prevention	1,194,100	775,400
Recreation	427,600	253,400
Agricultural, Municipal, and Industrial Water	193,900	41,300

Capital Costs	P.L. 566 Funds Dollars	Pct.	Other Funds Dollars	Pct.	Total Dollars
Land Treatment Measures	383,000	12	2,779,700	88	3,162,700
Structural Measures Flood Prevention	7,523,600	78	2,100,000	22	9,623,600
Recreation	1,571,500	50	1,573,900	50	3,145,400
Agric. Water Supply	89,900	53	80,700	47	170,600
M&I Water Supply	2,900	1	339,200	99	342,100
Project Administration	3,088,900	89	386,600	11	3,475,500
TOTAL	12,659,800	63	7,260,100	37	19,919,900

April 6, 1983

SOUTH FORK LICKING RIVER WATERSHED, OHIO

The South Fork Licking River Watershed is located in east-central Ohio. It consists of 180,364 acres in Licking, Fairfield, and Perry Counties. Nearly 88 percent of the watershed area is in Licking County.

The largest city, partially in the watershed, is Newark with a population of 41,836 followed by Heath with 6,768 people. The total urban population is 39,553 and the rural population is estimated to be 18,921. The population of the area is growing quite rapidly, partially due to the very rapid expansion of the Columbus metropolitan area.

Approximately 60 percent of the watershed is in farmland. There are about 1,050 farms that average 160 acres in size. The farms are a combination of grain and livestock enterprises. Present land use of the project area shows 52 percent cropland, 25 percent herbaceaus land, 13 percent forest land, and 10 percent miscellaneous.

The economic and social conditions in the watershed are affected significantly by the industry around Newark and the proximity of the metropolitan area of Columbus. Many people live in the rural areas of the watershed but commute to the factories and businesses in Newark and Columbus.

The major flood problem in the watershed is the periodic flooding of crops, pasture, urban and industrial areas, and transportation systems. Flooding causes an estimated average annual damage of $112,800 to crops, pastures, and related agriculture properties. Direct damages to transportation facilities and urban properties are estimated to be $435,800. Approximately 8,355 acres, 449 dwellings, and 35 businesses are affected by flooding in the watershed.

Erosion rates result in average annual soil losses ranging from four to eight tons per acre per year. It is estimated that channel erosion consisting of streambank, gully, and road bank erosion is responsible for 18,950 tons of soil loss per year. Other problems in the watershed include sediment deposition in rural and agriculture flood plains and in ponds, reservoir, and drainage systems; inadequate drainage on about 42 percent of the watershed cropland; and a lack of recreation facilities in a watershed that will be within one hour or less driving distance of 2,000,000 people by the year 2,000.

The planned project consists of conservation land treatment measures for watershed protection and structural measures for flood prevention, recreational use and environmental quality improvement. The structural measures and land treatment are to be installed over an eight year period.

One hundred and twenty eight conservation plans and 31 conservation plan revisions will be prepared with landowners for the conservation treatment and management of their land during the project period. Land treatment measures are planned to adequately protect 14,230 acres of which 9,530 will be treated through the ongoing program and 4,700 acres will be treated through the accelerated program. These measures include conservation cropping systems, forest land, pasture and hayland improvements, and related measures.

The structural measures are a combination of earthen dams, dikes, channel improvements, and recreation facilities. Two dams are planned for the project. One is for floodwater retarding and one is for floodwater retarding and recreation use. A flood prevention dike is planned along 0.3 miles at the south edge of Hebron. The channel improvements consist of 0.7 miles of channel enlargement, 3.3 miles of new flood by pass channel and obstruction removal from 18.2 miles of channel.

Recreation facilities are planned for two locations. Facilities of the Lobdell Creek Reservoir will provide swimming, boating, fishing, hiking, camping, and picnicking. The South Fork Licking River, from U.S. 40 to Hoback Park in Heath, will be developed for canoeing and picnicking. A proposed mitigation plan for the project includes wildlife planting and fish and stream improvement structures.

The accelerated land treatment measure will reduce soil loss, increase water infiltration and improve wildlife habitat and the surrounding environment. Erosion will be reduced on 2,880 acres of cropland, 1,060 acres of pastureland, 600 acres of forest land, and 60 acres of other lands by an estimated 34,600 tons per year. Sediment yield at the mouth of South Fork will be reduced 5,000 tons per year. Improvements will occur in farming efficiency, timber stands and forest management, water management, and cover conditions.

Installation of structural works of improvement for flood prevention and recreation will produce average annual benefits of $1,365,600. The benefits will result from the reduction in floodwater damages of agricultural and urban lands, more intensive use of agricultural land, and recreation development. Average annual costs for these purposes are estimated to be $859,100.

Reduction in urban damages, estimated at $369,100, will occur at Buckeye Lake, Granville, Hebron, and Newark.

Average annual benefits to reduce flooding of crop and pasture land are estimated at $55,400. More intensive use from reduced flood hazard on agricultural land will provide an estimated $152,300 in benefits to the watershed. Other reductions in agricultural, transportation, travel delays, and indirect damages will amount to $81,000 in benefits.

The recreational facilities at Lobdell Creek Reservoir and on South Fork will provide additional recreation opportunities with estimated average annual benefits of $707,800. Redevelopment benefits stemming from project installation are estimated to be $43,600.

SOUTH FORK-LICKING RIVER WATERSHED, OHIO

Size and Location

180,364 acres in Licking, Fairfield, and Perry Counties

Sponsors

South Licking Watershed Conservancy District
Licking County Soil and Water Conservation District
Fairfield County Soil and Water Conservation District
Perry County Soil and Water Conservation District
Licking County Commissioners
Fairfield County Commissioners
Perry County Commissioners
Newark Area Chamber of Commerce

Purposes

Flood Prevention and Recreation

Principal Measures

Soil Conservation practices on farms and structural measures consisting of one multiple purpose flood prevention-recreation structure, 3.3 miles of new flood bypass channel, 11.9 miles of channel modification, and two recreational developments.

Annual Benefits and Costs 1/	Average Annual Dollars	
	Benefit (7-7/8)	Cost
Flood Prevention	657,800	350,300
Recreation	707,900	508,800

Capital Costs 2/	P.L. 566 Funds		Other Funds		Total
	Dollars	Pct.	Dollars	Pct.	Dollars
Accelerated Land Treatment	269,000	17	1,309,600	83	1,578,800
Structural Measures					
Flood Prevention	3,563,000	83	715,000	17	4,278,000
Recreation	1,918,600	51	1,850,600	49	3,769,200
Project Administration	1,397,600	89	175,600	11	1,573,200
TOTAL	7,148,400	64	4,050,800	36	11,199,200

1/ Based on April 1983 Addendum; 7-7/8% interest rate, 100-year project life.

2/ Price Base 1982

May 1983

CALAPOOYA CREEK WATERSHED, OREGON

Calapooya Creek Watershed is located about 150 miles south of Portland, Oregon, and 50 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. It consists of 157,300 acres in southwest Oregon's Douglas County. Approximately 39 miles long and 14 miles wide, the watershed is drained by Calapooya Creek, a perennial stream rising in steep mountains forming the eastern watershed boundary of the State.

The watershed population of 3,500 people is rural with Oakland the only sizeable community of 1,030 people. The major industry is timber and wood products, which provides about 40 percent of the jobs in Douglas County. Agriculture provides about 2 percent of the county jobs.

There are about 200 farms in the Calapooya Watershed ranging in size from many very small (5-7 acres) to over 3,000 acres. The average farm size is 300 acres. The five major categories of land use are: irrigated land, 2,140 acres; dry cropland, 1,390 acres; pasture, 43,420 acres; forest, 106,820 acres; and other 3,530 acres. All watershed lands are privately owned except for 13,250 acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

Present irrigation and municipal water withdrawals from Calapooya Creek often reduce summer flows to nearly zero. As late season demands increase, there is not enough flow and some users must be denied water. In addition, Oregon law imposed minimum flow requirements on Calapooya Creek to meet fishery demands.

About 860 irrigated acres in the watershed have water rights dated early enough to assure an adequate water supply for most years. The sponsors have determined a firm demand for irrigation water for 2,105 acres within the project service area. In addition, the sponsors have determined a projected need for this project of 500 acre-feet for Oakland and 1,770 acre-feet for Douglas County in the Oakland/Sutherlin vacinity.

Three water quality problems have been identified in the watershed. These include temperature associated with low summer flows, a high sediment content in Calapooya Creek, and a higher than allowable presence of fecal coliform on Pollock Creek.

Flooding is a frequent event in the watershed causing damage primarily to agricultural lands along Calapooya Creek. The agriculture lands flooded are mostly grass, hay, and pastureland. Flood damages are estimated at $156,430 annually.

This project has been developed for watershed protection, irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply, flood prevention, and water-based recreation. Planned works of improvement include conservation land treatment, one multiple-purpose dam, water-based recreational development, and associated onfarm irrigation and drainage measures. The project is planned for installation over a 5-year period.

33-558 O—84——3

The principal feature of this project is a 100-foot high earth dam at the Pollock Creek site. The reservoir will have a total capacity of 12,750 acre-feet with 5,460 acre-feet of net storage for irrigation, 2,270 acre-feet for municipal and industrial water supply, 3,985 acre-feet for recreation, and 430 acre-feet for fish mitigation. There will be a joint-use flood retarding pool of 3,600 acre-feet.

Associated onfarm measures will consist of irrigation and drainage facilities. Irrigation will be by individual systems, each consisting of a pumping plant, a delivery system, an application system, and appurtenances. Some 36 irrigation systems will serve 2,105 acres of land. Approximately 600 acres will need some degree of drainage for optimum production under irrigation.

Forty multiple-use management plans for land treatment will be developed and applied by private nonindustry landowners on an estimated 13,600 acres of forest land in the watershed. The Oregon Department of Forestry will prepare the plans, including reforestation on 400 acres, timber stand improvement on 1,000 acres, harvesting techniques and utilization, and marketing opportunities.

Nonstructural measures of the project include the use of information on flooding areas and soils data by the county in revised land use zoning, the monitoring of water quality in Pollock Reservoir, and the consideration of water conservation in the design of onfarm systems and in irrigation water management plans.

A recreation facility on the Pollock Creek Reservoir will include a picnic area, an open recreation area, swimming beaches, sanitary facilities, and boat launching and docking areas. As mitigation for lost anadromous fish habitat, minimum flows of 8-10 cfs will be maintained in Pollock Creek below the dam in November through May, and 7-14 cfs from May through October. As mitigation for lost terrestrial wildlife habitat, approximately 57 acres of new habitat will be developed and maintained.

The installation of project structural measures will result in total average annual benefits of $1,089,950. Flood damage reduction benefits will be $12,100 per year. Other average annual benefits are: irrigation, $287,760; recreation, $535,220; and municipal and industrial water supply, $254,870. Enhancement of fish habitat will improve water quantity and quality in the summer and fall. Average annual costs are $789,240.

CALAPOOYA WATERSHED, OREGON

Size and Location - 157,300 acres in Douglas County

Sponsors -

Calapooya Water Control District
North Douglas Soil and Water Conservation District
Douglas County
City of Oakland

Purposes -

Watershed Protection, Flood Prevention, Irrigation, Municipal and Industrial Water Supply, Water-Based Recreation

Principal Measures - Soil conservation practices on farms and structural measures consisting of one multiple purpose dam, water-based recreational development, and associated on-farm irrigation and drainage measures.

Annual Benefits and Costs	Average Annual Dollars	
	Benefit (7 3/8 -	Cost 100 years
Flood Prevention	12,100	6,520
Irrigation	287,760	253,100
Recreation	535,220	383,170
M&I Water Supply	254,870	146,450

Capital Costs	P.L. 566 Funds Dollars	Pct.	Other Funds Dollars	Pct.	Total Dollars
Land Treatment Measures	190,710	12	1,404,950	88	1,596,660
Structural Measures Flood Prevention	83,400	100	140	0	83,540
Irrigation	897,920	34	1,755,980	66	2,653,900
M&I	1,900	1	1,893,470	99	1,895,370
Recreation	2,046,590	50	1,981,000	50	4,027,590
Project Administration	1,103,080	95	61,500	5	1,164,580
TOTAL	4,323,600	38	7,097,040	62	11,420,640

September 17, 1982

LOS OLMOS CREEK WATERSHED, TEXAS

The Los Olmos Creek Watershed is located in far south Texas in portions of Jim Hogg and Starr Counties. It comprises an area of about 204,470 acres. The drainage area consists of numerous creeks and arroyos all of which have ephemeral flow. The watershed topography ranges from gently rolling in the upper portions to nearly level at the lower portion in the vicinity of Rio Grande City.

The economy within the area relies primarily on agriculture, with Rio Grande City serving as a market center. Rangeland is the prevailing land use in the watershed, comprising about 96 percent of the total.

There are approximately 150 farm and ranch units averaging about 1,350 acres in size, either wholly or partially within the watershed. The size of individual operating units range from less than 100 to more than 2,000 acres. About 98 percent of the agriculture land is owner-operated.

Starr County not only suffers from a large unemployment rate of 31.3 percent in 1979, but it is also within a geographic area that has the lowest per capita income in the nation of $2,960 in 1978.

The principal problem within the watershed is flooding from Los Olmos Creek and the contributing drainage area of Sandia Creek which results in damages to residents of Rio Grande and El Sauz, and businesses, agriculture properties, and other properties estimated to average $566,020 annually. Flooding on agriculture lands damages crops, pastures, and farm improvements. Flood waters inundate highly productive areas planted to vegetables and cause complete crops loss.

Flood waters create potential health hazards, provide vector habitat, and cause many inconveniences tending to lower the quality of life in the watershed. Residents of Rio Grande City and El Sauz who suffer from flood damages are affected by monetary losses, threats to loss of life and displacement from homes. A potential shortage of potable water exist in Rio Grande City because the water treatment and pumping facility are located in the flood plain.

There is also a need to provide better range management practices throughout the watershed. Much of the rangeland is overgrazed and indiscriminate clearing of mixed brush chaparral without wildlife considerations has removed unique wildlife habitat.

The recommended plan addresses the purposes of flood damage reduction to urban property and to agriculture flood plain lands. The works of improvement are one single-purpose floodwater retarding structure and two dikes, one at EL Sauz and one at Rio Grande City, to be installed within a four year period.

The floodwater retarding structure will be an earth dam with a principal spillway and plunge basin, two emergency spillways, a sediment pool, and a floodwater retarding pool. Both dikes will consist of compacted earth fill and will protect downstream development from a breach of the floodwater retarding structure. In addition, the Rio Grande City dike will protect the urban area from the one percent chance storm runoff from the area (376 square miles) not controlled by the floodwater retarding structure.

The recommended plan will reduce the average annual flood damages to urban property in Rio Grande City and El Sauz, reduce average annual flood damages to agriculture properties, eliminate the risk of loss of life in every building in the flood hazard area, and improve the quality of life and social will being to the residents of the area. The average annual damage reduction benefits for existing conditions would be $580,000. Habitat losses attributable to the structural measures will be compensated for by managing 686 acres for wildlife and vegetative plantings on disturbed areas. Average annual costs are estimated to be $398,000.

LOS OLMOS CREEK, TEXAS

Size and Location

204,470 acres in portions of Jim Hogg and Starr Counties

Sponsors

Starr County Commissioners Court
Starr County Soil and Water Conservation District
Monte Mucho Soil and Water Conservation District

Purposes

Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention

Principal Measures

Structural measures consisting of one floodwater retarding structure and two dikes totaling 20,577 feet.

Annual Benefits and Costs	Average Annual Dollars	
	Benefit (7 5/8 - 100 years)	Cost
Flood Prevention	580,310	397,390

Capital Costs	P.L. 566 Funds Dollars	Pct.	Other Funds Dollars	Pct.	Total Dollars
Structural Measures Flood Prevention	2,824,330	80	700,450	20	3,524,780
Project Administration	599,920	99	7,000	1	606,920
TOTAL	3,424,250	83	707,450	17	4,131,700

October 6, 1982

TESTIMONY OF JOSEPH W. HAAS, DEPUTY CHIEF FOR NATURAL RESOURCE PROJECTS, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD RIEKERT, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, BASIN AND PLANNING DIVISION, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HAAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I should mention that Peter Myers, our Chief, expresses his regret at not being able to be here today. He was scheduled to come yesterday, but due to the change in schedules he is not able to make it today.

Nevertheless, I am pleased to personally appear before your committee to support the five projects you have mentioned, and I have with me Mr. Ed Riekert on my right, who is Assistant Director of our Basin and Area Planning Division, who will assist and provide a brief explanation of each project if you wish.

As with all projects of the Soil Conservation Service, these five were initiated by local units of government and other sponsoring organizations. The project applications have passed through the office of the Governors to assure consistency with State plans and programs.

As you know, watershed projects are developed by teams that cooperate with local conservation districts, county governments, and other local entities. Local steering committees are generally formed to give guidance to the planners and help establish planning objectives, priorities, and help select the final plan. Many times sponsors actually provide resources to aid the planning effort in services or dollars.

The administration has been reassessing the Federal role in water development and the procedures by which projects are formulated. It is our position that national economic development is the appropriate objective to guide the formulation of projects, and generally we will recommend the plan that produces the greatest net economic benefit, unless other factors warrant an exception. In fact, minor exceptions have been granted by the Secretary of Agriculture for four of the projects before you today. The NED plan was selected for implementation by the sponsors in the Los Olmos Watershed plan. The Brundage Watershed and Calapooya Creek plans provide for reduced Federal outlays compared to the NED plan, and the Elk Creek and South Fork and Licking River plans include a small additional increment of Federal costs to provide additional benefits to the environment.

It's also our policy that direct beneficiaries should bear a substantial burden of the costs of services they receive from water projects, and that services should be provided by the public or private organizations that provide them at the lowest real cost. Federal water project planners should, of course, give full consideration to local, State, and international concerns, as they help develop project features which benefit non-Federal interests to be paid for by those interests.

The watershed program administered by the Soil Conservation Service is compatible with all of these concepts. Watershed projects are not direct Federal undertakings. They are initiated by local

sponsoring organizations. In addition, State and local entities participate financially in a substantial manner. The amount of participation varies by purpose. For flood prevention, local sponsors provide all land rights and will operate and maintain the completed facilities, while the Federal Government pays the construction costs. At least 50 percent of any costs allocated to recreation are paid by project sponsors, including land rights. And for drainage and irrigation, sponsors provide at least 50 percent of the construction costs and provide all land rights required.

I should mention that during the next few years, we will be giving highest priority to planning projects that emphasize erosion control, flood prevention, and water conservation. We will continue to encourage multiple-purpose projects to make optimum use of construction sites, but expect the primary purpose to be those mentioned for future planning efforts.

Now, in the interest of time, I would like to turn immediately, with your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Riekert to provide a brief explanation of each of these projects.

Mr. RIEKERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me first introduce the Brundage Watershed. This watershed contains 45,000 acres and is located in Adams County, south-central Idaho. The major watershed problem is shortage of late summer and fall season forage for beef cattle. This is caused by an inadequate water supply to meet the July, August, and September irrigation needs and by the low level of management, the physical facilities allow the irrigators to practice. It has been determined that the existing Brundage Reservoir dam is unsafe and must be either breached or rebuilt to modern specifications. Therefore, the Brundage Watershed project has been planned to provide full season irrigation water supply, improve overall irrigation efficiencies, and improve the quality of the Brundage Reservoir fishery and wildlife habitat.

Structural measures include construction of a new dam at the site of the existing Brundage Reservoir. Works of improvement on the irrigation distribution systems will consist of repair or replacement of deteriorating structures which presently have an estimated life of less than 25 years. This project will also include new turnout structures, plus an additional 30,000 feet of new ditch. The land treatment program consists of ongoing and accelerated technical and financial assistance to the watershed landowners and operators. The Forest Service program includes seeding of approximately 20 acres of woodland vegetation, also six wildlife islands constructed and vegetated to enhance wildlife habitat.

The estimated average annual benefits occurring to the structural measures are estimated to be $320,000. These benefits include reduced operation and maintenance, and increased agricultural production. The average annual costs are estimated to be $243,000.

The Calapooya Creek Watershed consists of approximately 157,000 acres, and is located in Oregon's Douglas County. There are about 200 farms in this watershed, ranging in size from many which are very small in size of 5 to 7 acres to over 3,000 acres. All watershed lands are privately owned except for about 13,000 acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

Present irrigation and municipal water withdrawals from the Calapooya Creek often reduce summer flows to nearly zero. As late

season demands increase, there is not enough flow and some users must be denied water. In addition, Oregon law imposes minimum flow requirements on Calapooya Creek to meet fishery demands. Flooding is a frequent event in this watershed causing damage primarily to the agricultural lands along Calapooya Creek. Agricultural lands flooded are mostly grass, hay, and pastureland. Flood damages are estimated at about $156,000 annually.

This project has been developed for watershed protection, irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply, flood prevention, and water-based recreation. Planned works of improvement include conservation land treatment, one multipurpose dam, and recreation facilities. The principal feature of this project is the 100-foot-high earth dam at the Pollock Creek site. Also, associated on-farm measures will consist of irrigation and drainage facilities. Multiple-use management plans for land treatment will be developed and applied by private landowners on an estimated 13,600 acres of forest land in the watershed. The Oregon Department of Forestry will prepare the plans, including reforestation, timber stand improvement and foresting techniques, and utilization and marketing opportunities. The installation of project measures will result in total average annual benefits of about $1.1 million. The average annual costs for this project are estimated to be $789,000.

The next project is the Elk Creek Watershed in Kansas. This watershed covers approximately 89,000 acres in Atchison, Jackson, and Nemaha Counties of northeastern Kansas. The major problems in this watershed are flooding, erosion, and grade instability. Approximately 8,800 acres are subject to flooding, including 6,600 acres of cropland. Flood damage averages about $1 million annually, including $282,000 in gully damages and $413,000 crop and pasture damage. Other problems in the watershed include a shortage of water-based public recreation areas and a shortage of water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural use.

This project has been planned for watershed protection, flood prevention and grade stabilization, water supply, and public recreation. Planned project measures include accelerated associated land treatment on 8,000 acres of cropland, 5,800 acres of grassland, and 2,700 acres of forest land. Farmers cooperating with conservation districts will apply the land treatment. Seventy grade stabilization structures will be installed to stabilize grades and reduce flooding. A multipurpose earthfill dam will be constructed to provide storage for the floodwater and water supplies for agricultural and municipal and industrial uses. The total annual benefits for the structural measures on this project are estimated to be approximately $1.8 million. The estimated average annual cost is estimated to be about $1.1 million.

The South Fork Licking River Watershed is located in east-central Ohio. It consists of about 180,000 acres in Licking, Fairfield, and Perry Counties. About 60 percent of this watershed is farmland. The economic and social conditions in the watershed, however, are affected significantly by the industry around Newark and the proximity of the metropolitan area of Columbus. Many people live in the rural areas of the watershed, but commute to the factories and businesses in Newark and Columbus.

The major flood problem in the watershed is the periodic flooding of crops, pasture, urban and industrial areas, and transportation systems. Other problems in the watershed include sediment deposition in rural and agricultural flood plains and in ponds, reservoirs, and drainage systems. There's also a lack of recreation facilities in the watershed that will be within 1 hour or less driving distance of approximately 2 million people by the year 2000.

The planned project consists of conservation land treatment measures for watershed protection and structural measures for flood prevention, recreational use, and environmental quality improvement. The installation of structural works for improvement for flood prevention and recreation will produce average annual benefits estimated at about $1.4 million, and average annual costs are estimated to be about $860,000.

The fifth project is Los Olmos Creek Watershed in Texas. This is located in Jim Hogg and Starr Counties and comprises an area of about 204,000 acres. The economy within this area relies primarily on agriculture, with Rio Grande City serving as a market center. Rangeland is the prevailing land use, comprising about 96 percent of the total. Starr County not only suffers from a large unemployment rate, estimated to be about 31 percent in 1979, but it is also within a geographic area that has the lowest per capita income, of about $3,000 in 1978.

The principal problem within the watershed is flooding from Los Olmos Creek. The recommended plan addresses this problem, and the objective is to reduce flooding to the residential and business property and to agricultural flood plain land. The estimated average annual damage reduction benefits would be approximately $580,000. Average annual costs are estimated to be about $400,000.

Mr. HAAS. Mr. Chairman, that concludes our technical presentation of these five projects. We attempted to summarize the details of each. If you have questions, please feel free to ask.

Mr. ROE. We thank both of you for your excellent testimony. Any questions from the gentlemen? No questions. We want to thank you very much for being with us this morning, and we'll proceed from here. Thank you.

Mr. Stangeland?

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to submit additional questions to Mr. Haas.

Mr. ROE. Without objection, so ordered.

[The questions submitted by Representative Stangeland and responses received from Mr. Haas follow:]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1984.

Hon. ARLAN STANGELAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STANGELAND: I have enclosed responses to your questions submitted as followup to my testimony on March 15, 1984, on five watershed projects of the Soil Conservation Service.

Sincerely,

EDGAR H. NELSON,
Acting for JOSEPH W. HAAS,
Deputy Chief for Natural Resource Projects.

Enclosure.

Congressman STANGELAND. On page 2 of your testimony you mentioned that four of the five projects before us today differ in one regard or another from the National Economic Development (NED) Plan. It would still appear, however, that the projects were developed in order to meet the balanced variety of resources and environmental needs. Do you still support authorization of these projects in their present form?

Mr. HAAS. We do support the approval of these four projects in their present form. While we believe that National Economic Development (NED) is the appropriate objective to guide Federal participation in water resource projects, there will be circumstances that warrant a project differing in some respects from the NED objective. These circumstances will vary with the individual case and cannot be predicted.

Congressman STANGELAND. Would you outline the process that could be expected to follow approval of these projects, including the other steps that SCS and the local sponsors will follow? Do you have an estimate of when first construction funding for the projects could be expected?

Mr. HAAS. Immediately after Congress approves these projects, the Soil Conservation Service will began the final designs for the structural measures and local sponsors will begin the acqusition of landrights. When all landrights have been acquired and all local cost sharing is assured, a project is ready for construction. It is estimated that the Brundage Watershed could be ready for a construction start in fiscal year 1984. For the South Fork Licking River Watershed construction could begin on a small increment of channel within one year. It is estimated that the other three projects: Calapooya Creek Watershed, Elk Creek Watershed, and Los Olmos Creek Watershed, will take about two years before construction could be initiated. This time is necessary to do the final design work on the larger structure.

Congressman STANGELAND. In September of 1982, this committee approved four projects, the Upper Mud River Watershed in West Virginia, South Zumbro Watershed in Minnesota, Mozingo Creek Watershed in Missouri, and Little Calumet Watershed in Illinois. Can you tell us, or provide for the record, the status of each of these projects and whether any have been received, or have been programmed to receive, construction funding?

Mr. HAAS. The Upper Mud River Watershed in West Virginia is undergoing detailed design during fiscal year 1984. Construction is scheduled to start in 1985. South Zumbro Watershed in Minnesota will also be ready in 1985. Mozingo Creek Watershed in Missouri was ready to begin construction in 1983, but did not receive a construction start due to other higher priority projects. The Little Calumet River Watershed in Illinois was approved for a construction start on June 30, 1983. In fiscal year 1983, $3.4 million was obligated for this project.

Congressman STANGELAND. On page 3 of your testimony you mention that highest priority for planning new projects will emphasize control, flood prevention, and water conservation. I have several questions about this priority system.

(a) How did your agency go about deciding on these three purposes and when did this new priority system go into effect?

(b) Are these priorities solely for planning or are they also to be used for decisions on which projects will receive construction funding?

(c) I note that three of the projects before us today, the ones in Ohio, Idaho, and Oregon, have significant benefits in areas other than the ones you list as priorities. Do you still intend to actively pursue construction of these projects?

Mr. HAAS. These three purposes, the reduction of excessive soil erosion, the reduction of flood damages in upstream areas, and the conservation of agriculture water use, were established as a result of the Soil and Water Conservation Act of 1977. This Act directed the Secretary of Agriculture to appraise the Nation's soil, water, and related resources and to make the programs administered by the Secretary responsive to the long term needs of the Nation as determined by the appraisal. These three purposes are a part of the National Program for Soil and Water Conservation sent to the Congress by the President on December 2, 1982. They apply to the planning of new watershed projects and will be applied to implementation of older projects if it becomes necessary to establish priorities for construction. Once projects are authorized, we consider this a firm commitment to implement them and will proceed to do so within the limits of appropriations.

Mr. ROE. Now our first witness on the Brundage project is our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Larry Craig. We want to welcome you to our committee. You are a very distinguished Member of Congress, and a good friend of this committee.

The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. I just want to welcome Mr. Craig as well, Mr. Chairman; and I look forward to his testimony.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Craig, the full text of your prepared statement will appear in the record at this point.

[Statement referred to follows:]

TESTIMONY BY CONGRESSMAN LARRY E. CRAIG

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for holding this hearing today to give myself, and my colleague Senator Symms the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Brundage Watershed.

The Brundage Reservoir project is something that I was involved with as a State senator and now as a congressman representing Idaho. The Brundage Watershed project in Adams County, Idaho, has been planned to provide the full season irrigation water supply, improve overall irrigation efficiencies, and improve the quality of the Brundage Reservoir fishery and wildlife habitat. The reservoir will be installed, operated and maintained by the Brundage Water Users Association. The Goose Creek Canal improvements and its operation and maintenance and replacement will be carried out by the Goose Creek Canal Company. The improvement, operation maintenance and replacement of the south end ditch will be carried out by the South End Ditch Company. Technical assistance will be provided to each company by the Adams Soil Conservation District.

Why do we need this project? A few years ago, the Forest Service determined that the existing Brundage Reservoir was unsafe and must be either breached or rebuilt to modern specifications. As I stated above, the Adams County Soil Conservation Service, the local water companies and communities all sat down and agreed to this upgrading and committed the financial obligations necessary to accomplish the job. What has been the hold-up?

In 1981, the Soil Conservation Service submitted the Brundage Watershed project to the Office of Management and Budget for approval. The OMB decided to keep this project buried in the bowels of its bureaucracy, until Senator Symms and I wrenched it out of their hands and had it forwarded to Congress. This was the first step in what has become a long and arduous task.

The second step was taken by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on August 3, 1983. The Senate committee met and heard testimony on four similar soil conservation service watershed projects, all of which received strong support. No objections were raised. The committee voted out the resolution authorizing these projects. The next step is up to the House.

The Brundage Watershed Reservoir project is a good project. It is needed to enhance local land management practices, wetland protection, fishery operations, and the safety of the people who reside in the immediate area. The Soil Conservation Service has determined that the cost benefit ratio is 1.4 to 1. This shows that the projects benefits will exceed costs and this rarely happens in the Halls of Congress.

We now need to have the Water Resources Subcommittee concur with the Senate and recommend the authorization of the Brundage Watershed project, in addition to the four watershed projects before you today. Once we have your concurrence, the next step is to gain support from the full Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to take prompt action on the Brundage Reservoir project and the projects supported by our colleagues here today. The sooner we obtain your support, the sooner we can work to gain passage of the resolution from the full committee and start construction in our respective states.

Mr. Chairman, let me thank you once again for holding this hearing. I also extend to you the appreciation of Idahoans who support the construction of the Brundage Reservoir project.

Mr. ROE. Please proceed.

TESTIMONY OF HON. LARRY E. CRAIG, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Mr. CRAIG. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I will be brief, because I understand you have before you a rather descriptive explanation of the Brundage Watershed project. Let me give you a couple of personal observations that deal with the Brundage

project and the concern of the farmers and ranchers that are involved with the project.

Last fall, I went to the dam and reservoir site of the existing Brundage facility, which is a good many years old, built in the thirties and one of the reclamation work projects coming out of the Depression; one that has served this area extremely well over the years.

The dam that currently serves as the water impoundment facility for the Brundage Reservoir, believe it or not, is in such condition that you can, and I did, reach up inside the dam and break parts of the concrete loose with your hands.

It is in such a condition of just simply age and decay that literally at any given moment under the right circumstances, the Department of Water Resources of the State of Idaho along with the Corps and the Conservation Service, and the Soil Conservation Service, could demand that the gates be lifted on that dam, and that it not be allowed to store water behind it.

If that were to become the case or the situation, it would leave a rather large and extremely fertile valley without water for the period of time that it would take to recondition that dam.

Therefore, this request has come forward for those purposes, not only to refurbish the facility, but to extend the facility. I know most of the farmers and ranchers in that area. I know that they have taken it upon themselves to do a good deal of the maintenance work on their own.

Last fall, they went in with the permission of the Soil Conservation Service using their ranch and farm equipment to clear some of the new reservoir or water storage land that would be involved.

The cost-benefit ratio of this project is good. It broadens the whole aspect of the facility, not only for utilization of irrigation, but for recreation, fisheries, and wetlands. It is a nice project that combines all of those types of considerations to give us a good cost-benefit ratio.

Mr. ROE. Splendid.

Are there any questions of our distinguished colleague?

[No response.]

Mr. ROE. If there are no further questions. From what I understand, Senator Symms will be here, but he got called for a Finance meeting. So we will pick up his testimony later.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that my entire testimony be included in the record.

Mr. ROE. Without objection, so ordered. The entire statement has been put in the record as you submitted it.

Mr. CRAIG. Thank you.

Mr. ROE. Thank you very much for being with us this morning. We appreciate your time.

Mr. CRAIG. Thank you.

Mr. ROE. We have received a statement from Senator Steven D. Symms of Idaho regarding the Brundage Watershed project. And, without objection, the statement will appear in the record at this point.

[Statement referred to follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF IDAHO

Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct pleasure to return to this body to testify in favor of the Brundage Watershed project. First, I would like to commend you for scheduling this item in the midst of very heavy legislative responsibilities. As I told the Senate during their consideration of this project, these are small priorities in terms of the national and international issues that we address in Congress. But many Idaho farmers have worked very hard to see this idea become a reality, and to them, it is very important because it will improve their livelihoods.

I have personally been involved in this project for many years, first as a member of this body, and later as a member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. Despite the strong efforts of the project's supporters who live in the Meadow Valley near New Meadows, Idaho, this project found its way into the labyrinth of the Federal bureaucracy in Washington, D.C. The past 2 years, I have been engaged in trying to free the project from the bowels of the OMB. Despite repeated assurances of expedited action, this small and ordinarily routine project was only recently approved for congressional consideration. After that experience, it is a great pleasure to see both quick action on the Senate side, and your hearing today.

As staff will tell the members of this subcommittee, this project was initiated several years ago when the U.S. Forest Service determined that the existing dam and reservoir were unsafe, and that the dam had to be rebuilt or breached to ensure public safety. The latter option would have exacerbated the already inadequate supplies of irrigation water, resulting in further shortages of forage for livestock. This situation would, without question, throw future livestock and range operations into great jeopardy.

The answer to this potential problem was found in this project, which couples reconstruction of the dam with a review and revision of local land treatment practices, wetlands protections, and assurances that the dam will enhance fish resources. Structural improvements will be made to the dam (increasing the reservoir's storage capacity), and to canals, diversions, ditches and headgates.

It is an excellent project, the benefits of which will exceed costs by a 1.4 to 1 ratio. The project is a testament to the cooperative efforts of the local soil conservation district, the Brundage Water Users Association, the Goose Creek Canal Company, the South End Ditch Company, the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I am joined by these groups and many Idahoans in appreciation of your quick action on this project. As you know, since the Senate has already acted, only the approval of this subcommittee and the full committee are necessary to trigger the construction of the Federal share of this project. I stand ready to assist you and the full committee if I can be of any assistance to see this project through its obligatory congressional approval in the House.

Mr. ROE. Now our next project in the order of people who are arriving is the South Fork Licking River Watershed in Ohio. We have with us our distinguished colleague, John Kasich.

And, John, if you would be so kind to join us, we would appreciate it.

Mr. KASICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROE. I want to welcome you to the committee. Your statement will appear in full in the record. So if you want to go ahead, it is OK.

TESTIMONY OF HON. JOHN KASICH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO, ACCOMPANIED BY MS. WILMA STOKELY

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a privilege to appear this morning before your subcommittee in support of the South Fork Licking River Watershed project. Let me say that Clarence Miller from Ohio was to be here at this time. He has been delayed, Mr. Chairman, because of a scheduling problem.

On behalf of the project, it is my pleasure to affirm support for the statement submitted to this subcommittee by the South Fork Licking Watershed Conservancy District. This flood control project

has undergone 14 years of careful planning and preparation, and will bring countless benefits to the citizens of Licking, Fairfield, and Perry Counties of Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, once completed this project will affect over 180,000 acres of land, and will control serious flooding along Raccoon Creek and the South Fork of the Licking River.

Plans call for extensive flood control measures and recreational improvements which will no doubt reduce crop damage, protect residences, prevent further soil erosion and sediment damage, and contribute greatly to the environmental quality of the area.

The project will have no effect on nor will it threaten endangered species or wetlands. Careful attention has been given to retaining the cultural and environmental resources by provide waterfowl and aquatic habitats, acres of water for boating and fishing, and land for other recreational facilities, as well as the practical aspects of creating flood prevention benefits for over 450 homes and 35 businesses while reducing water damage to pasture and croplands previously affected by continued flooding.

Stream erosion will be minimized by obstruction removal, and watershed protection will be achieved through the application of planned land treatment under an ongoing program.

These are only a few of the benefits this project will establish for the citizens of these affected central Ohio communities. And I know firsthand of the tremendous local interest in the construction of this project.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the plan being considered by the subcommittee today has been in preparation for many, many years. The proposal has been prepared under the provisions of the USDA's small watershed program, and has been refined within the new Federal cost-benefit ratio guidelines.

I respectfully request the subcommittee's authorization for this project, and I thank you for the time that you have afforded me to testify before this subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, they are doing an outstanding job out there. The project will enable a variety of things to be accomplished. But the bottom line is some protection for people's homes and some businesses, and obviously all of the other good things that come with it including elimination or cutting down on soil erosion, and of course recreational benefits.

And they worked very well with people throughout the community, the entire community there, to assure that the project goes forward with good strong public support.

Mr. ROE. Splendid.

Are there any questions of our distinguished witness?

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROE. The gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you.

Let me just before I begin, I recognize the students from Springfield High School in beautiful downtown Delaware County, Pa., who have joined us here.

I just have one question. What kind of cost sharing is involved in the project, how much local financial or lands easements and right of way are provided locally?

Mr. KASICH. Wilma Stokely on my staff.

Ms. STOKELY. As far as I understand, it is a $9 million project with $6 million Federal funds and $2 million coming from local taxes and county funds.

Mr. EDGAR. So there is a $2 million commitment of local sharing. One of the things that we are doing in our omnibus water bill is to attempt to change public policy in the area of cost sharing. So, not only will the dollars go further, but we have local investment. And it is helpful to see that this project does have that local investment.

Ms. STOKELY. I think that these were revised at OMB to fall within the guidelines that we are talking about.

Mr. EDGAR. Are there any major groups that are in opposition to the project?

Mr. KASICH. There is really no one. There are some people who live within the area where the dam is going to be built who have been concerned about the ability to travel, to cross the waterway. What I told them from the beginning is you make sure that when you put these programs together, that you sit down with the affected people in the area.

And while they may initially have some objection, if you are willing to work with them, you can generally work it out. I am really unaware of any project where you could not work out any kind of particular problem that comes as a result of some kind of development. And I think that they have done an excellent job of that.

And the other thing is that this project has been in the planning stages forever, and ever, and ever. And I just think that they have done a very, very good job in putting it altogether, consulting local groups, working with the State government, the local government, the Federal Government, in trying to gather broad support for the project.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you very much.

Mr. ROE. The gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCEWEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank the Congressman for his appearance here today. And, on behalf of himself and Congressman Miller, it was my pleasure to make petition that this be on the agenda. And my only purpose in asking for this time, Mr. Chairman, is to thank you for putting this on the program today, so that we could hear the testimony and act expeditiously.

And on behalf of the Ohio delegation, Mr. Chairman, we say thank you very much.

Mr. ROE. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend our colleague for his fine testimony.

Are there any further questions of the distinguished gentleman?

[No response.]

Mr. ROE. If not, I want to thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Mr. ROE. We appreciate you being with us.

Now, in view of the fact that we are going to have, in a minute, the bells signaling a call to the House to vote, I think that we ought to recess for 10 minutes, to go record our votes and then return.

[Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.]

Mr. ROE. The subcommittee will reconvene. We have with us now our distinguished Representative from Ohio, the Honorable Clarence Miller.

TESTIMONY OF HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a statement and I also have a formal statement from the South Licking Watershed Conservancy District, Licking County, Ohio, that I would like to have included for the record.

Mr. ROE. With no objection, so ordered.

[Statement referred to follows:]

SOUTH LICKING WATERSHED CONSERVANCY DISTRICT,
March 14, 1984.

The South Licking Watershed Conservancy District was formed in 1969 following the devastating flood of 1959. The district was formed by the Conservancy Court, made up of the Common Pleas Court Judges from Licking, Fairfield, and Perry Counties, Ohio, following the presentation of petitions from the freeholders in the district.

The Conservancy District directors through PL 566 have been working since 1969 to develop flood control plans for the South Fork of Licking River and Raccoon Creek. The project will benefit 180,000 acres in Licking, Fairfield, and Perry Counties. The project will reduce estimated average annual flood damages of $101,149 to crops, pastures, and related agricultural properties. Direct damages to transportation facilities including Interstate Highway 70 and urban properties are estimated to be $298,567. Approximately 8,355 acres, 449 dwellings, and 35 businesses are affected by flooding in the watershed annually.

The goals of the sponsors are:

1. Floodwater damage reduction for agricultural, commercial, industrial, and residential areas.
2. Erosion and sediment damage reduction.
3. Improved agricultural water management.
4. Recreation area development.
5. Improved appearance of the natural environment. Primary sponsors of the project since its inception include the following:

1. South Licking Watershed Conservancy District.
2. Licking County Soil and Water Conservation District.
3. Fairfield County Soil and Water Conservation District.
4. Perry County Soil and Water Conservation District.
5. Licking County Commissioners.
6. Fairfield County Commissioners.
7. Perry County Commissioners.
8. Newark Area Chamber of Commerce.

Local support for the project has developed because of the unique combination of benefits the project will provide to both urban and agricultural areas, while providing opportunities for public recreation, as well. Enthusiasm has been maintained because of a strong appraisal base from which to develop the local share of project funding. Support remains strong among local elected officials as evidenced by nearly 80 mayors, township trustees, and county commissioners in attendance at a recent update meeting.

The Conservancy District directors have been meeting monthly since the formation of the Conservancy District in 1969. They have reported progress to the Conservancy Court annually. They have levied administrative assessments within the watershed for interim operations.

The Conservancy District has endeavored to keep the public informed of the plan's progress through a vigorous publicity effort. Countless time and effort has gone into the development of the plan to date.

The directors and staff of the South Licking Watershed Conservancy District, along with primary sponsors listed above, feel that the project is vital to the economic and environmental well being of the project area. They are committed to its eventual installation.

South Licking Watershed Conservancy District Directors:

John E. Hankinson, Chairman, 4502 Worthington Road, Alexandria, Ohio 43001. John H. Weaver, Director, 1596 W. Main Street, Newark, Ohio 43055. Wendell Hartshorn, Director, 3858 Hebron Road SE, Hebron, Ohio 43025. Gordon C. Postle, Secretary-Treasurer, 743 E. Main Street, Newark, Ohio 43055.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, it is my distinct pleasure to appear before this distinguished subcommittee today to document my ongoing support for, and interest in, the approval of the South Fork Licking Watershed project. I am pleased to join my House colleague who appeared earlier, John Kasich, in endorsing this important project, and in encouraging the subcommittee to join the Senate in approving the resolution of authorization before us today.

This hearing represents a critical point in the life of the South, Fork Licking Watershed project. The project was approved by the Office of Management and Budget in May 1983, and was approved by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on August 4, 1983.

Approval by this subcommittee and the full Public Works and Transportation Committee will authorize a flood control project that has been in the planning stages for over 14 years.

The project being considered today by this subcommittee is in response to a history of widespread flooding along the Licking River in a three-county region of central and southern Ohio. Unchecked flooding and the loss of valuable property led local officials to form the South Licking Conservancy District in 1969.

The project under consideration today will provide the flood control and stability long sought and so greatly needed along the South Fork of the Licking River. Altogether, 180,364 acres of land are involved in the project. Project plans call for the construction of two flood control/recreational dams, stream channelization, and obtruction removal.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that widespread support for the project has been in evidence for years. Let me quote from a May 27, 1983, editorial from the Newark, Ohio, Advocate:

"We believe the benefits of the project far outweigh any further concerns the conservancy might have. The project will contribute greatly to the safety of landowners along the waterways and for residents of downstream communities."

Authorization of the project is being sought under the provisions of the USDA's small watershed program, Public Law 83-566. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that it fits the criteria of that very worthwhile program fully.

I would ask the subcommittee to approve the South Fork Licking plan for the benefit of those who are depending upon the blessings that it will bring.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify on this important matter. And I would like to submit my statement for the record, the additional part that I have not read, and as I had stated earlier, I have a statement from the South Licking Watershed Conservancy District that I would like to have included in the record.

Mr. ROE. With no objection, both statements will appear in full in the record.

We want to thank our distinguished colleague for his testimony. And the committee will give due deliberance to your testimony. Thank you for being with us this morning.

Mr. MILLER. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROE. Our next witness for this morning will be the Honorable Jim Slattery from Kansas. We want to welcome you to our committee. You may proceed.

TESTIMONY OF HON. JIM SLATTERY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. SLATTERY. Thank you, Mr Chairman, and members of the subcommittee. I wish to thank you for allowing me to testify in favor of the Elk Creek Watershed, an important flood control, water supply, and recreational area for northeast Kansas.

I support the contruction of this watershed project. And to reach the point we have arrived at here today has taken more than 5 years of cooperative work between Federal, State, and local governments. Their dedication was certainly worth the effort, and I want to commend local officials and the Soil Conservation Service for an outstanding job.

I was pleased that the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee approve this project and respectfully ask for its approval by this subcommittee and the full House Public Works and Transportation Committee.

The Elk Creek Watershed is not a small project. When completed, it will cover 139 square miles, or slightly more than 89,000 acres. It will provide an estimated $1.8 million in annual benefits compared to just over $1 million in annual costs.

It is important for residents of Jackson, Nemaha, and Atchison Counties. Six local government units worked hard to keep their end of the bargain so the project could reach this stage; 37 percent of the watershed will be funded at the local level, a firm indication of the support this project has among local residents. A 63-37 percent Federal-local funding agreement is an excellent ratio.

Flood control will be the most significant benefit of the Elk Creek Watershed. Damage from floods in the affected area has averaged almost $995,000 a year, and has been particularly harmful to valuable crop and pastureland. Flood prevention benefits each year will average $1.19 million according to estimates by the Soil Conservation Service.

In addition, the site proposed for the watershed is one of the most erosion-prone areas in the entire State of Kansas. Almost half a million tons of soil are displaced each year. Construction of the watershed will reduce damage from erosion by more than $600,000 a year.

The project also will be a primary source of water for the city of Holton and for Jackson County. Perry Reservoir is the only existing impoundment large enough to meet future water needs in the area, but piping water from Perry into the watershed site is prohibitively expensive.

Estimates indicate the cost would be one and a half to two times as much as the cost of water that will be stored in the watershed. The multiple-purpose structure near Holton will be a valuable ad-

dition to the fine recreational areas in northeast Kansas, and should be an economic boon to the nearby areas.

To sum up, the Elk Creek Watershed will be a valuable asset to northeast Kansas, and particularly to residents of Jackson, Nemaha, and Atchison Counties. The watershed will serve many purposes and deserves the endorsement of this subcommittee.

I respectfully request that funding be approved. Thank you again for granting me the privilege of appearing here today to testify in support of the Elk Creek Watershed. I appreciate the opportunity to be here.

Mr. ROE. We have received a statement from Senator Nancy Kassebaum regarding the Elk Creek Watershed project, and without objection, the statement will appear in the record at this point.

[The statement referred to follows:]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to comment on the merits on the Elk Creek Watershed project in Atchison, Jackson, and Nemaha counties of Kansas. The Watershed Plan and Environmental Impact Statement which has been sent to your committee for consideration represents over 20 years of organization, planning, and cooperation between the communities, their residents, and the state and federal officials. Construction of this project will not only aid the local three-county area, but the entire plan will also have a positive impact on the state's efforts for flood control and water storage and supply.

As the project plan outlines, this watershed is primarily for flood control and water supplies in these northeastern Kansas counties. Flooding, erosion, and grade instability are major problems in this hilly, agricultural area. Elk Creek Watershed is one of the more highly erosive areas of the state, with an annual soil erosion displacement of 485,000 tons. Overbank flows or flooding occurs as often as twice a year, and generally not less than once every two years. These flood damages average almost $995,000 on an annual basis. Such expenses are a tremendous burden on the local municipalities and small towns, as well as a continual drain on the state's treasury. Farmers suffer agricultural losses, and all in the area have to cope with roadway and bridge damage which accompanies local flooding.

The watershed plan includes construction of a multipupose structure, or lake, which will provide floodwater retardation, water supply, and public recreation. Seventy stabilization structures will be installed to retard sedimentation. Land treatment measures on 16,500 acres will further reduce soil erosion and sedimentation problems.

Other problems which would be alleviated by construction of this watershed plan are the shortage of water for municipal, industrial, and agricultural use and water-based public recreation areas. Water supply facilities will be developed by the city of Holton, with a population of 3,240, and a local rural water district. Recreational facilities on the multipurpose structure will be developed by Jackson County.

A final point I would make in regard to this watershed plan is the beneficial impact that its construction and implementation will have on a larger reservoir on the Delaware River, an important water source for eastern Kansas communities. The Army Corps of Engineers estimates that construction of this, and a companion watershed plan along the Delaware River, would slow the sedimentation inflow and extend by 25 years the useful life of Perry Lake. State and national water-use plans and conservation efforts do not always mesh so conveniently, and for the benefit of an entire area, as they do in this fortunate situation of the Elk Creek Watershed plan.

I am sure that you will determine, from today's hearings and review of the Elk Creek Watershed plan, that this project is well thought out and its planning has taken into account the many factors which lead to solid community interest and support in the watershed plan. The Senate Environment and Public Works committee, which held hearings on this watershed plan in July of 1983, did approve the Elk Creek Watershed resolution. It is worthy of committee consideration and authoritization.

Thank you.

Mr. ROE. I thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. SLATTERY. Thank you.

Mr. ROE. We have no other witnesses this morning. What we will do is now adjourn this hearing. And we will keep the record open, however, for 5 days for any members who wish to submit statements.

[Statements received follow:]

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JIM WEAVER

Chairman Roe, Members of the Committee: It gives me great pleasure to testify before you in support of a Soil Conservation Service project in Douglas County, Oregon. It is a project authorized by P.L. 566, and primarily sponsored by the Calapooya Water Control District. It is an outstanding project, and I strongly urge you to give it your full support.

The Calapooya Watershed Project has been in the development stages for 15 years. The Environmental Impact Statement was completed in 1979 and in 1981 SCS forwarded the project to the Office of Management and Budget. OMB thoroughly and favorably reviewed the formulation, implementation, effects and cost/benefit ratio of the project. Last year, the U.S. Senate approved the project and forwarded it to the House for consideration.

The Calapooya Watershed project enjoys unanimous support at the local level. When it is completed, the project will provide for watershed protection, irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply, flood control and water based recreation. In short, it is exactly the sort of project that this body can be proud of supporting.

Douglas County, Oregon is among the hardest hit economically in the entire nation. This project on Pollock Creek will bring new life to agricultural activity in the area through irrigation. It will also provide for diversification of the economic base by making light industry and tourism possible.

Along Calapooya Creek, in the vicinity of the proposed Pollock Reservoir, there are 7,400 acres that could be successfully irrigated with an available water supply. Two municipalities, Oakland and Sutherline, draw their water from Calapooya Creek. Unless this project is completed, all planned growth will stop by 1990 and existing industry will face extreme water shortages.

Fish and wildlife currently suffer from water shortages along the streams because of late season diversions by those with existing water rights. The watershed frequently floods, causing extensive damage to agricultural lands on an almost annual basis. Flooding also does some damage to roads, bridges and buildings, including homes. The once in 10-year storm will flood approximately 2,000 acres.

The projected demand for water-based recreation is estimated at 2.3 million annual occasions. Existing recreation areas are capable of supplying only 30 percent of today's need without regard to the future. This proposed multi-purpose dam structure will be 12,750 acre feet with a surface area of 440 acres, and will provide tremendous recreation opportunities. It is a relatively small project with enormous benefits.

The Water District, Douglas County farmers, and the public are willing and prepared to provide the ⅔ funding match if this Subcommittee acts favorably.

Thank you for your time. Again, I urge your immediate and positive action. The people in this part of the 4th District have been patient, and are anxiously awaiting your action.

STATEMENT BY E (KIKA) DE LA GARZA

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to have the opportunity of addressing your Subcommittee on the matter of the Los Olmos Creek watershed—and I appreciate your having invited me to do so.

Mr. Chairman, it's only by very good luck that Starr County in my South Texas Congressional District has not suffered any more damage from erosion and flooding than it has while three federal entities (the Soil Conservation Service; Environmental Protection Agency; and Office of Management and Budget) fiddled with its Los Olmos Creek watershed application.

In the Autum of 1982 OMB finally transmitted the project papers to the President of the Senate, and in the Summer of 1983 the Senate Subcommitee on Water Resources—and then the Committee on Environment and Public Works—approved the Los Olmos project. I am here today for the same purpose which brought me to the Senate hearing room last year—to ask for quick action on this project.

The Los Olmos Creek watershed project is becoming something of a legend in South Texas. The project was initially conceived in 1960 by the Starr County Commissioners Court, and since that time it has been a household word in Starr County. This proposed watershed is of immense value to the residents of the County for three principal reasons:

1. The watershed is needed to protect the environs of Rio Grande City (the major urban area of the County) from routinely expected flood visitations. Current and future homeowners and businesses will realize a new property security if the watershed is constructed;

2. The watershed will help prevent loss of valuable topsoil in the vast farming areas of the County. Topsoil erosion is the major contributor to harvest decline and the watershed would provide an immediate bulwark against further gross losses; and

3. Los Olmos Creek watershed would provide an economic shot in the arm for Starr County which currently staggers under an unemployment rate of over 40 percent. Jobs creation by itself would be good reason for the watershed's construction.

Mr. Chairman, I will not use my address to recount the statistics and figures which pertain to this project. Your able Subcommittee has already digested the pertinent data. The $3.4 million dollar federal investment in the project will reap a nearly 90 percent reduction in annual damages to the County. Each year, an estimated $560,000 in floodwater damages occurs and within 7 years the entire federal investment will have been re-couped in reduced dollar damages to the area.

My purpose is to appeal for the project's approval on behalf of the many local and county officials in Starr who have labored for more than 20 years to see this project become a reality. The action we take today will not affect you and me. It will, however, positively affect the residents of Starr County by removing one of their anxieties—the fear of more floodwater damage and soil erosion in an area that has trouble enough as it is. I want to thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the opportunity to speak on behalf of the Los Olmos Creek watershed project—leaving it in your capable hands.

[Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

○